



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/725,652	12/02/2003	Richard V. Zampell	200310807-1	4519
22879	7590	12/20/2005	EXAMINER	
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400			YAN, REN LUO	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2854	

DATE MAILED: 12/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/725,652

Applicant(s)

ZAMPELL, RICHARD V.

Examiner

Ren L. Yan

Art Unit

2854

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 September 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 5, 6, 8-11 and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Takeuchi et al(5,860,644). The patent to Takeuchi teaches the structure of an imaging apparatus as claimed including a main unit P having a printing unit and a media input tray, and a physically separate auxiliary unit B that couples with and physically supports the main unit P in a stacked configuration. The Auxiliary unit B includes a media input tray F and a document finishing mechanism(stacker S and sorter M) disposed side by side and has substantially the same footprint as that of the main unit P. Regarding claim 17, since the media input tray F and the document finishing mechanism(stacker S) has to be accessible from the exterior of the auxiliary unit B in order for the imaging apparatus to work properly, an opening on the housing wall of the auxiliary unit B would inherently be provided in order for the user to replenish the media supply to the media input tray F and remove the stacked printed document from the stacker S from outside of the auxiliary unit B. See Fig. 1 and column 2, lines 29-64 in Takeuchi et al for details. With respect to the newly added process step in claim 17 “and a document is inputted through the slot to undergo a finishing operation”, it is noted that the document and the imaging device operator for placing the document inside the imaging device do not form any part of the imaging device structure as claimed. Since the imaging device of Takeuchi et al has the

Art Unit: 2854

same structure as in the presently claimed invention, it is certainly considered as being capable of carrying out the function of finishing the document being placed on the stacker. As established above, document stacking is a finishing operation. With respect to claims 9 and 18, the finishing mechanism(stacker S) is integrated with the media input tray and the auxiliary unit B as a whole unit.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2-4, 12, 14 and 21-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takeuchi et al in view of Guerrero(6,549,749). Takeuchi et al teach all that is claimed except that the type of print mechanism contained in the printing unit is not disclosed and the finishing mechanism does not have a stapling mechanism or a hole punching mechanism as recited. The patent to Guerrero teaches the structure of an image device including a main unit having a print mechanism(the upper part of printer 10A) and an auxiliary unit positioned below and couples with the main unit and having an integral document finishing mechanism 64(the lower part of the printer 10A). See Figs. 2-7 in Guerrero for example. With respect to claims 2, 4 and 23, the printer of Guerrero includes a laser scanner that emits a laser beam to create a latent electrostatic image on a print drum 12. See column 3, lines 13-21. With respect to claims 3 and 24, Guerrero teaches in column 2, lines 58-67 that the printer can be a laser printer, an inkjet

Art Unit: 2854

printer or other types of printers. With respect to claims 12, 14 and 21, Takeuchi et al teach a plurality of document finishing mechanisms such as a sorting mechanism and a stacking mechanism which are operable to perform a finishing operation concurrently. However, Takeuchi et al do not teach the use of stapling, binding, hole punching, folding and trimming mechanisms, even though these are all well known finishing mechanisms in the printing art. Guerrero teaches in column 6, lines 15-40 that the document finishing mechanism could be a stapler, a binder, a hole puncher, etc. In view of the teaching of Guerrero, it would have been obvious to those having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the imaging apparatus of Takeuchi et al with a laser or inkjet print mechanism in order to efficiently carry out the printing operation and the known stapling, binding and hole punching mechanisms in order to enable the finishing mechanism to carry out multiple finishing operations on printed documents.

Claims 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takeuchi et al in view of Kawahira(6,801,750). The patent to Takeuchi et al teaches all that is claimed except that it does not specifically provide the document finishing mechanism with a folder and a trimmer. Kawahira teaches in an image forming device equipped with a document finisher the conventional use of a folder and a trimmer to carry out the book-binding process. See column 5, line 44 through column 6, line 13 in Kawahira for example. In view of the teaching of Kawahira, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the document finishing mechanism in the image forming device of Takeuchi et al with the folder and trimmer appropriately disposed in order to make the image forming device capable of doing more functions.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takeuchi et al in view of Dim et al(6,460,843). Takeuchi et al teach all that is claimed except that the finishing mechanism is not a spiral binding mechanism. Dim et al teach in column 1, lines 11-19 that finishing mechanisms that are capable of stapling, spiral binding, etc. have been known since the first books were printed. It would have been obvious to those having ordinary skill in the art to provide the document finishing mechanism of Takeuchi et al with the known spiral binding mechanism as taught by Dim et al when the printed document is desired to be finished with spiral binding.

Applicant's arguments filed on 9-6-2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. It is noted that applicant's main argument is that Fig. 1 of Takeuchi shows the base unit B has a footprint that is substantially larger than the footprint of printer P, while the present claims require that the auxiliary unit has a footprint that is substantially the same as the footprint of the main unit. According to applicant, for at least this reason, claim 1 is allowable over Takeuchi et al. This argument is not persuasive. First of all, since the drawing figures in the patent applications are not made to scale, they are not to be relied on to make any dimensional comparisons. Secondly, the choice words "substantially the same" in the present claims are certainly intended to cover the two units with the same footprint or slightly different sized footprints. It is the opinion of the Examiner that the footprint of unit B in Takeuchi et al is considered slightly larger than the footprint of unit P, taking into account the overall sizes of the two units, and thus the relationship between the two footprints would quality within the coverage

Art Unit: 2854

provided by the phrase “substantially the same” as recited. The other arguments are believed to have been adequately responded to in the forgoing rejections.

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ren L. Yan whose telephone number is 571-272-2173. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner’s supervisor, Andrew Hirshfeld can be reached on 571-272-2168. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2854

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ren Yan", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Ren L Yan  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2854

Ren Yan  
Dec. 15, 2005